

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are amended for clarity and to correct informalities. The specification is amended. The drawings are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawing Objection

The Office Action objects to the drawings. Fig. 1 is amended to include the voice modulation device and Fig. 4 is amended to correct "Change" to obviate this objection. The specification is amended to correspond with the amendments to the drawings. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under §103(a)

1. The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0123311 to Kim et al. (hereinafter "Kim") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0120494 to Jiang et al. (hereinafter "Jiang"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Kim does not teach the call-terminating exchanger requesting a call connection to the sound providing means based on the first and the second information when the calling terminal requests a call to a called terminal, wherein the specific sound is generated by combining a subscriber information sound for specific information, which can identify a called subscriber or can represent the subscriber's character, with a common ringback tone replacement sound set by the called subscriber. The Office Action asserts that Jiang remedies these shortfalls of Kim. The analysis of the Office Action fails for the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that the specific sound is generated by combining a subscriber information sound for specific information, which can identify a called subscriber or can represent the subscriber's character, with a common ringback tone replacement sound set by the called subscriber, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 10 and 19, is disclosed by Jiang at paragraph [0018].

Paragraph [0018] of Jiang discloses merely that the present invention allows the operator of a telecommunication network to deploy the user selected ring back tones, music clips, and announcements to a subscriber, that these techniques enhance existing intelligent network (IN) mechanisms, without violating the current and existing compliances, and that this functionality is applicable to both originating and terminating IN custom ringback services and can be combined with any current existing services, such as prepaid, VPN (virtual private network), or as a standalone postpaid IN based service. Therefore, Jiang would not have suggested combining any sounds, because Jiang merely discloses combining a mechanism or services not sounds. Further, Jiang teaches at, *e.g.*, paragraph [0019] that the custom ringback will be heard in place of the existing network-wide ringing tones currently heard today. Thus, Jiang teaches replacement of ringing tones currently heard today but would not have suggested any combination of personal or subscriber information sound with a replacement sound.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Kim with Jiang cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1, 10 and 19. Further, the combination of Kim with Jiang cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 21 and 22 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang are respectfully requested.

2. The Office Action rejects claims 2, 11, 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and U.S. Patent No. 6,768,789 to Wilk et al. (hereinafter "Wilk"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Kim and Jiang do not teach wherein text information of the personal information sound is converted into a voice by a text-to-speech engine. The Office Action asserts that Wilk remedies these shortfalls of Kim and Jiang. As argued above, Kim and Jiang cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all of the features recited in claims 1, 10 and 19. Wilk, as applied to claims 1, 10 and 19, does not remedy the above-discussed shortfalls of Kim. Therefore, the combination of Kim with Jiang and Wilk cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited

in claims 2, 11, 12 and 20 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 11, 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and Wilk are respectfully requested.

3. The Office Action rejects claims 4, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0203613 to Zhu et al. (hereinafter "Zhu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Kim and Jiang do not teach a voice modulation device. The Office Action asserts that Zhu remedies these shortfalls of Kim and Jiang. As argued above, Kim and Jiang cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 19. Zhu, as applied to claims 1 and 19, does not remedy the above-discussed shortfalls of Kim and Jiang. Therefore, the combination of Kim with Jiang and Zhu cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 4, 23 and 24 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and Zhu are respectfully requested.

4. The Office Action rejects claims 7-9 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0193125 to Smith. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Kim and Jiang do not teach personal information sound is different by time zone. The Office Action asserts that Smith remedies these shortfalls of Kim and Jiang. As argued above, Kim and Jiang cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 10. Smith, as applied to claims 1 and 10 does not remedy the above-discussed shortfalls of Kim and Jiang. Therefore, the combination of Kim with Jiang and Smith cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 7-9 and 16-18 for at least the dependence of

these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang and Smith are respectfully requested.

5. The Office Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang, Wilk and Zhu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Kim, Jiang and Wilk do not teach a voice modulation device. The Office Action asserts that Zhu remedies these shortfalls of Kim, Jiang and Wilk. As argued above, Kim, Jiang and Wilk cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all of the features recited in claim 10. Zhu, as applied to claim 10, does not remedy the above-discussed shortfalls of Kim, Jiang and Wilk. Therefore, the combination of Kim with Jiang and Wilk cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combination of all of the features recited in claim 13 for at least the dependence of this claim on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that this claim recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang, Wilk and Zhu are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: September 20, 2010
YSH/MWL/fyk